UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,430	07/16/2003	James D. Shaw	CDS 5015	1736
27777 PHILIP S. JOH	7590 01/27/201 <b>NSON</b>	EXAMINER		
JOHNSON & J		WRIGHT, PATRICIA KATHRYN		
	WICK, NJ 08933-7003		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/27/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jnjuspatent@corus.jnj.com lhowd@its.jnj.com gsanche@its.jnj.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/621,430	SHAW, JAMES D.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
P. Kathryn Wright	1797	

	P. Kathryn Wright	1797	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>10 December 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperior Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar it, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE r).	g date of the final rejection E FIRST REPLY WAS FII	n. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origithan three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wind AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
	out prior to the data of filing a briat	will not be entered be	
3.  ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, k (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	•	ducing or simplifying tl	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reig	ected claims	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1)		solod ciaiirio.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	* **	mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	_
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3-5,7-11,14-19,35-43 and 46-48</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>15-19 and 35-43</u> .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	thefere or on the date of filling a Ni	-tion of Ammont:!! mot	h = = = t = = = d
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10.	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/P. Kathryn Wright/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Jnit 1797	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: At least new claims 54 and 55 fail to conform with 35 USC 112 and would require further consideration by the Office. Proposed claims 54 to 55 recite "the element". This is confusing and indefinite. First, what corresponds to "the element" in the claims, specification and drawings? Second, "the element" lacks antecedent basis. In addition, proposed claims 73 and 74, correspond to original claims 12 and 13. Original claims 12 and 13 were canceled by Applicant in response to the objection to the drawing under 37 CFR 1.83(a), see Official action filed September 26, 2007. It is hereby respectfully requested that Applicant carefully inspect any filed claims to insure that they conform with US patent practice.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of arguments of record. Further, it appears Applicant's arguments are based substantially on the proposed amendment, which has not been entered for the reasons set forth above..